

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1-46 have been rejected. Claims 1-17, 23, 24, 26, and 32-46 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised to introduce no new matter. Claim 25 has been canceled. Claims 1-24 and 26-46 are pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office Action states that claims 32-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is purportedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 32-46 have been amended to require a computing system, which includes a computing device having a processor, a server, and a computer storage medium. Moreover, claim 32 requires that elements of the claim be maintained on the computing device. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 32-46 are drawn to a physical structure and request that the rejection of claims 32-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn. Claims 32-46 are believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-26 and 28-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Quicktime 6 API reference in view of Terada, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0079036. Claim 25 has been canceled thereby rendering rejection thereof moot.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for processing media data. Claim 1 has been amended to require transferring, by a stream-source object, multimedia data to a control layer, which provides a single interface between the stream-source object and a plurality of other objects, wherein the stream-source object operates subject to control of a media-source component. Claim 1 also requires receiving at the control layer the multimedia data, which

includes a plurality of media data streams in different formats, and transferring one or more of the media data streams to a transform object, which converts the one or more of the media data streams into a format that is usable by a data sink. Moreover, claim 1 includes receiving in the control layer the one or more of the media data streams, which has been converted into the format. Furthermore, claim 1 requires transferring the one or more of the media data streams to a stream-sink object, which is usable to transfer the one or more of the media data streams to the data sink, wherein the stream-sink object operates subject to a media-sink object that implements a state machine to control a state of transfer of the one or more of the media data streams on a per stream basis, the state machine being implemented according to a control signal from the control layer. The control layer signals the one or more stream sinks that one or more discontinuities exist in one or more media data streams by placing an associated marker in the one or more media data streams.

As amended, claim 1 requires that various operations be facilitated by the one control layer. Applicants did not discover any portion of the cited references that describe such a control layer, which isolates the objects from one another and provide a single point of control. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references and that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn. Claim 1 is believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

“If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” MPEP § 2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Claims 2-22 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the above stated reasons. Claims 2-22 are believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 has been amended to require throttling the progress of the plurality of media data streams at a stream sink by controlling a rate of allocation. In contrast, to support a rejection of this element (as previously recited in claim 25), the Office Action refers to media handlers, which fetches, stores, or caches data. *See QT6 API*, pg. 2933 (relied on by the Office Action). Applicants did not discover any portion of the cited references that describe throttling data by controlling a rate of allocation.

Moreover, claim 23 requires an exchange between a transform object and the control layer. That is, the control layer receives media data streams, transfers a media data stream to the transform object to be modified, and then receives the media data stream that has been modified. As previously indicated, Applicants did not discover any portion of the cited references that describe a control layer, which serves as a single point of control.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to render claim 23 obvious and that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claim 23 is believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

“If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” MPEP § 2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Claims 24, 26, and 28-31 depend from claim 23 and are patentable for at least the above stated reasons. Claims 24, 26, and 28-31 are believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claim 32 is directed to a computing system that is configured to provide a multimedia system. The multimedia system comprises both a control layer and a core layer. Claim 32 requires that the control layer is configured to provide a single interface to a media source, a transform, a media sink, and a stream sink. Moreover, claim 32 requires that the core

layer include the media source, which transfers to the control layer a media data stream; the transform, which receives the media data stream from the control layer and converts a format of the media data stream; the media sink; and a stream sink.

As previously presented, Applicants did not discover any portion of the cited references that describe such a control layer, which isolates the objects from one another and provide a single point of control. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is patentable over the cited references and that the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn. Claim 32 is believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

“If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” MPEP § 2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Claims 33-46 depend from claim 32 and are patentable for at least the above stated reasons. Claims 33-46 are believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Quicktime 6 API reference in view of Terada and Dahley, U.S. Publication No. 2005/0132408.

“If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” MPEP § 2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Claims 5 and 27 depend from claims 1 and 23 respectively and are patentable for at least the above stated reasons. Claims 5 and 27 are believed to be in condition to be allowed and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-24 and 26-46 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or adobrien@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. A fee has been submitted together with a request for a two-month extension of time to file this Response. It is believed that no other fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/ANDREW D. O'BRIEN/

Andrew D. O'Brien
Reg. No. 57,064

ADO/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550